REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Feldman (U.S. Patent Publication No. US2002/021675 A1). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for the following reasons.

Applicants by way of this amendment have amended claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 20, 22, and 24 to more clearly claim the present invention. Applicants have further added new claims 26-31. Claims 1-31 are pending in the application.

Claim 1, recites, in part, a combination of features for a method for analyzing a data network having a plurality of routers including:

accessing at least one of static routing information and route summarization information;
determining if a particular network prefix is included in the accessed information;
determining an identity of a network device based on an identity included in the accessed information corresponding to the network prefix;

Feldman, the sole reference relied on by the Examiner, is directed to providing a network-wide view of topology and configuration information in a packet-switched network. More particularly, Feldman discloses an abstract data model that comprises information relating to connectivity, addressing, and routing in the network. This data model is disclosed as being populated from various network information sources including router configuration files.

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that Figs. 4 and 5 along with paragraphs 0010 and 0031-0034 disclose the step of accessing at least one of static routing information and route summarization information. Fig. 4 illustrates a software architecture for processing router configuration files and populating a data model.

Although Fig. 4 illustrates various routing protocols including static routes and OSPF, it does not illustrate determining if a particular network prefix is included within the accessed information.

Fig. 5 illustrates an IP router configuration file that includes a router section with entries for various protocols such as OSPF, BGP, and static routes. Fig. 5, however, merely illustrates a configuration file and as such does not illustrate determining if a particular network prefix is included in the accessed information.

With regard to the text cited by the Examiner, Paragraph 0010 provides a summary of the invention of Feldman. Although this section discloses a data model comprising data objects containing information relating to connectivity, addressing, and routing in a network, along with populating the data model using configuration files, it does not mention accessing static routing information or route summarization information. Accordingly, this section does not disclose determining if a particular network prefix is included in the accessed information.

With regard to paragraphs 0031-0034, these paragraphs describe that each link object may be defined by an IP prefix attribute and that each autonomous system may employ a routing protocol, such as OSPF. Additionally, these paragraphs provide a general overview of static routes. These paragraphs, however, do not disclose accessing this OSPF and static route information and determining if a particular network prefix included in the accessed information.

The Examiner alleged that Feldman discloses the step of determining an identity of a network prefix using the accessed information. In support, the Examiner cited page 3 paragraphs 0030-0034 of Feldman. Paragraph 0030 discloses that neighboring

routers may exchange traffic over links, and that each link may be identified by an IP prefix. This paragraph, however, does not disclose determining if a particular network prefix is included in the static routing information or route summarization information.

As discussed above, paragraphs 0031-0034 merely describe that each link object may be defined by an IP prefix attribute, that each autonomous system may employ a routing protocol, such as OSPF, and a general overview of static routes. These paragraphs, however, do not disclose accessing this OSPF and static route information and determining if a particular network prefix is included in the accessed information.

Accordingly, these sections do not disclose determining if a particular network prefix is included in the accessed information, where the accessed information includes at least one of static routing information and route summarization information.

If the Examiner believes Feldman discloses determining if a particular network prefix is included in the OSPF information or static route information, Applicant respectfully requests that that the Examiner identify the paragraph and line numbers of such disclosure.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over Feldman, for at least the reason that Feldman does not teach accessing at least one of static routing information and route summarization information, and determining if a particular network prefix is included in the accessed information.

Applicants additionally respectfully submit that claim 1 is further allowable for the additional reason that Feldman does not teach or suggest determining an identity of a

network device based on an identity included in the accessed information corresponding to the network prefix, as recited in claim 1.

Independent claims 7, 8, and 14 include similar recitations to that of claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 7, 8, and 14 are likewise allowable over <u>Feldman</u> for at least the above-discussed reasons with respect to claim 1. Applicant further submits that claims 2-6, 9-13, and 15-19 that depend on independent claims 1, 8, and 14 are likewise allowable at least due to their dependence on the corresponding independent claims.

The Examiner also rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by <u>Feldman</u>

Claim 20 recites:

> A method for determining an identity of a network device, the network device being associated with a network prefix, the method comprising:
> accessing one or more of a border gateway protocol peering table, a static route table, an open shortest path first route summarization table, and a network topology table;
> determining whether one or more of the accessed tables contains the network prefix; and
> determining an identity of the network device using the accessed tables when at least one of the accessed tables is determined to contain the network prefix.

In the Office Action the Examiner alleged that <u>Feldman</u> discloses accessing one or more of a border gateway protocol peering table, a static route table, an open shortest path first route summarization table, and a network topology table, and determining whether one of the accessed tables contains the network prefix. In support, the Examiner relied on Fig. 4 and page 3 paragraphs 30-34 of <u>Feldman</u> as disclosing the determining step.

As discussed above, Fig. 4 illustrates a software architecture for processing router configuration files and populating a data model. Although Fig. 4 illustrates various routing protocols including static routes and OSPF, it does not illustrate determining if a network prefix is contained within the accessed information.

As discussed above, paragraph 0030 discloses that neighboring routers may exchange traffic over links, and that each link may be identified by an IP prefix and paragraphs 0031-0034 describe that each link object may be defined by an IP prefix, attribute, that each autonomous system may employ a routing protocol, such as OSPF, and a general overview of static routes. These paragraphs, however, do not disclose accessing this OSPF and static route information and determining if these tables contain a particular network prefix.

Additionally, in rejecting claim 20, the Examiner relied on Figs. 4 and 5 and paragraphs 0024-0031, asserting that they disclose the step of determining an identity of a network device when the table is determined to contain the network prefix.

As discussed above, Fig. 4 merely illustrates a software architecture for processing router configuration files and populating a data model. Fig. 4, however, does not illustrate the step of determining an identity of a network device using accessed tables when at least one of the accessed tables is determined to contain the network prefix.

Likewise, Fig. 5, although illustrating an IP router configuration file that includes a router section with entries for various protocols such as OSPF, BGP, and static routes, it does not illustrate the step of determining an identity of a network device using

accessed tables when at least one of the accessed tables is determined to contain the network prefix.

Paragraphs 0024-0025 merely provide an overview of a router, paragraphs 0026-0028 merely provide an overview of interfaces on a router, and paragraphs 0029-0031 merely provide a description of routers exchanging traffic over links. None of these paragraphs, however, discloses determining an identity of a network device using accessed tables when at least one of the accessed tables is determined to contain the network prefix.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 20 is allowable over Feldman for at least the reason that Feldman does not teach accessing one or more of a border gateway protocol peering table, a static route table, an open shortest path first route summarization table, and a network topology table, and determining whether one of the accessed tables contains a particular network prefix. Applicants further respectfully submit that claim 20 is also allowable over Feldman for the additional reason that Feldman does not teach determining an identity of a network device using the accessed tables when at least one of the accessed tables is determined to contain the network prefix.

Applicant further respectfully submits that independent claims 22 and 24, which include similar recitations to that of claim 20, are likewise allowable over Feldman for at least the reasons discussed as to claim 20. Applicant further respectfully submits that claims 21, 23, and 25 that depend on independent claims 20, 22, and 24 are allowable at least due to their dependence on claims 20, 22, and 24.

With regard to new claims 26-31, applicants respectfully submit that new claims 26-31 are likewise allowable for at least one or more of the above-stated reasons.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account No. 07-2339.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _8/29/2003_   By: _James K. Weixel_

James K. Weixel
Reg. No. 44,399

Verizon Corporate Services Group Inc.
600 Hidden Ridge, HQE03H01
Irving, TX 75038
(781) 466-2220